

**UNPUBLISHED**

UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS  
FOR THE FOURTH CIRCUIT

---

**No. 02-4099**

---

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA,

Plaintiff - Appellee,

versus

SARAH ARLENE WHITLOCK,

Defendant - Appellant.

---

Appeal from the United States District Court for the District of South Carolina, at Greenville. Margaret B. Seymour, District Judge. (CR-01-705)

---

Submitted: June 11, 2002

Decided: July 3, 2002

---

Before LUTTIG, KING, and GREGORY, Circuit Judges.

---

Affirmed by unpublished per curiam opinion.

---

Leesa Washington, Assistant Federal Public Defender, Greenville, South Carolina, for Appellant. David Calhoun Stephens, Assistant United States Attorney, Greenville, South Carolina, for Appellee.

---

Unpublished opinions are not binding precedent in this circuit. See Local Rule 36(c).

PER CURIAM:

Sarah Arlene Whitlock pled guilty to one count of stealing from an authorized depository for mail on the premises of a United States Post Office, in violation of 18 U.S.C. § 1708 (1994). Whitlock was sentenced to fifteen months' imprisonment. The district court ordered the sentence to run consecutively with an undischarged state sentence. Whitlock's attorney filed a brief in accordance with Anders v. California, 386 U.S. 738 (1967), stating there are no meritorious issues for appeal but raising as a potential issue the district court's failure to impose a term of imprisonment to run concurrently to the state sentence. Whitlock was informed of her right to file a pro se supplemental brief but has not done so.

We find the district court did not err by imposing a sentence to run consecutive to the state sentence. See 18 U.S.C. § 3584(a) (1994); United States v. Rogers, 897 F.2d 134, 137 (4th Cir. 1990).

In accordance with Anders, we have reviewed the entire record and have found no meritorious issues for appeal. We therefore affirm Whitlock's conviction and sentence. We require that counsel inform her client, in writing, of her right to petition the Supreme Court of the United States for further review. If the client requests that a petition be filed, but counsel believes that such petition would be frivolous, then counsel may move in this court for leave to withdraw from representation. Counsel's motion must

state that a copy thereof was served on the client. We dispense with oral argument because the facts and legal contentions are adequately presented in the materials before the court and argument would not aid the decisional process.

AFFIRMED